



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,624	02/20/2004	Ricardo E. Paxson	MWS-110	7212
959 7590 05/16/2007 LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP ONE POST OFFICE SQUARE BOSTON, MA 02109-2127			EXAMINER SIMS, JASON M	
			ART UNIT 1631	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/16/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/783,624

Applicant(s)

PAXSON ET AL.

Examiner

Jason M. Sims

Art Unit

1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 February 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 23-44 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/25/06</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's election with traverse of group I, claims 1-22 and species A, in the reply filed on 2/20/2007 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that inventions I and II are capable of being used together and they are of the same class. This is not found persuasive because the different methods of Inventions I and II have different steps and different goals i.e., the method of Invention I is directed to simulation of a biological system, while the method of Invention II is directed to simulation of chemical reactions. Specifically, the method of Invention I comprises constructing a model for a biological system and generating dynamic behavior of the biological system, while the method of Invention II comprises constructing a model of chemical reactions and generating an expected result of the reactions. Thus, the Inventions have different design and mode of operation. Applicant's traversal of the species election requirement has been found persuasive and therefore the species election requirement has been withdrawn and all of claims 1-22 will be examined on the merits.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 23-44 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 2/20/2007.

Claims 1-22 are the current claims hereby under examination.

Art Unit: 1631

Drawings

Applicant's drawings filed 2/20/2004, have been considered and are fully compliant and have been entered.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 4/25/2006 has been considered by the examiner.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code, as in paragraph [0070]. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-22 are drawn to a process. A statutory process must include a final resulting step of a physical transformation, or produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result (*State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc.* CAFC 47 USPQ2d 1596 (1998), *AT&T Corp. v. Excel Communications Inc.* (CAFC 50 USPQ2d 1447 (1999)). The instant claims do not result in a physical transformation, thus the Examiner must determine if the instant claims include a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

Art Unit: 1631

As noted in *State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc.* CAFC 47 USPQ2d 1596 (1998) below, the statutory category of the claimed subject matter is not relevant to a determination of whether the claimed subject matter produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result:

The question of whether a claim encompasses statutory subject matter should not focus on *which* of the four categories of subject matter a claim is directed to 9-- process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter--but rather on the essential characteristics of the subject matter, in particular, its practical utility. Section 101 specifies that statutory subject matter must also satisfy the other "conditions and requirements" of Title 35, including novelty, nonobviousness, and adequacy of disclosure and notice. See *In re Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d 1354, 1359, 31 USPQ2d 1754, 1757-58 (Fed. Cir. 1994). For purpose of our analysis, as noted above, claim 1 is directed to a machine programmed with the Hub and Spoke software and admittedly produces a "useful, concrete, and tangible result." *Alappat*, 33 F.3d at 1544, 31 USPQ2d at 1557. This renders it statutory subject matter, even if the useful result is expressed in numbers, such as price, profit, percentage, cost, or loss.

In determining if the claimed subject matter produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result, the Examiner must determine each standard individually. For a claim to be "useful," the claim must produce a result that is specific, and substantial. For a claim to be "concrete," the process must have a result that is reproducible. For a claim to be "tangible," the process must produce a real world result. Furthermore, the claim must be limited only to statutory embodiments.

Claims 1-22 do not produce a tangible result. A tangible result requires that the claim must set forth a practical application to produce a real-world result. This rejection could be overcome by amendment of the claims to recite that a result of the method is outputted to a display or a memory or another computer

Art Unit: 1631

on a network, or to a user, or by including a final resulting step of a physical transformation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kurata (US A/N 2002/0022947).

The claims are directed to a system for improved simulation of a biological system comprising a plurality of chemical reactions, the system comprising a modeling component for constructing a model of a biological system including a first chemical reaction and a second chemical reaction and a simulation engine accepting as input said constructed model of the biological system and generating as output dynamic behavior of the biological system using a first type of computational model for the first chemical reaction and a second type of computational model for the second chemical reaction.

Kurata teaches claims 1 and 4-22 at the abstract, paragraphs [0001] – [00026] and [0049]. Kurata at paragraph [0004] discusses a computer system for modeling a biological system, which contributes to understanding the dynamic behavior of living cells. Kurata at paragraph [0006] further discusses simulators that employ differential equations to simulate a molecular process. Kurata at

Art Unit: 1631

paragraph [0007] discusses the simulation of a biological system that is composed of a mass of various chemical reactions. Kurata at paragraphs [0019]-[0023] teaches the use of ordinary differential equations analysis and algebraic equation analysis for use in the computational models and a simulator and simulation method that comprise an input part for receiving chemical reaction formulas and a part for partitioning the enzyme reaction formulas, which reads on a modeling component for constructing a model of a biological system including a first and a second chemical reaction. Kurata discusses throughout the invention receiving input for the chemical reactions, which are converted to algebraic and differential equations representations. Additionally, at paragraph [0049], Kurata teaches the ease for modifying the system by rewriting a chemical reaction formula, which reads on a graphical user interface for accepting user commands and reactions. Kurata at paragraphs [0024]-[0026] teaches computer readable media for performing all of the simulations in the cited invention.

Kurata teaches claims 2-3 in Figs. 1-5. Kurata shows block diagram modeling of related chemical reactions, which represents a modeling component that allows construction of a block diagram model of the biological system and a block identifying a set of related chemical reactions.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-22 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-19 of copending Application No. 10/783,628. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 1631

Claims 1-22 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-19 of copending Application No. 10/783552. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Sims, whose telephone number is (571)-272-7540.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla can be reached via telephone (571)-272-0735.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the Central PTO Fax Center. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The Central PTO Fax Center number is (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

// Jason Sims //

Lee A. Claus
Primary Patent Examiner
5/14/07